

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for indicating the acceptance of the drawings filed on February 17, 2004. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for acknowledging Applicants' claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119, as well as the receipt of certified copies of all of the priority documents. Applicants would also like to thank the Examiner for affixing his signature on a PTO-1449 form submitted with an Information Disclosure Statement on May 19, 2004, as well as for affixing his initials next to the citation of each document listed thereon to confirm consideration thereof.

In the outstanding Official Action, claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over HAMADA et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,483,318). In view of the herein-contained amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

As described in the Summary of the Invention section at page 1 of the present specification, the disclosed invention is directed to a focus detection device which is compatible with a plurality of photographic optical systems. In an exemplary embodiment of the present application shown in Figure 1, the focus detection device is a CCD focus detection device 61 and the photographic optical systems is an autofocus (AF) photographic lens 51. As described at page 8, line 20 to page 9, line 5, the CCD focus detection device 61 receives light that is projected from an AF optical system.

The combination of line sensors "I" and the monitor sensors "M" of a CCD focus detection device 61 can be selected according to the type of photographic

optical system used. Accordingly, the CCD focus detection device 61 is compatible with multiple photographic optical systems because the combination of line sensors “L” and monitor sensors “M” can be selected. The ability to adjust an operating mode of the CCD focus detection device 61 for different autofocus (AF) photographic lenses 51 is described at, e.g., page 13, lines 6-22 of the present specification.

With respect to the above-noted features of the invention disclosed in the present application, claim 1 has been amended to recite “a control device which selectively controls the driving of a combination of line sensors and monitor sensors, selected from said line sensors and said monitor sensors provided in said focus detection device, in accordance with a type of the autofocus optical system that projects light onto the line sensors “.

In contrast to the invention recited in amended claim 1, HAMADA discloses four types of monitor pixels M1 (M1') to M4 (M4') that are changed in accordance with a change in photographing conditions. However, the four types of monitor pixels M1 to M4 are not changed or varied in accordance with a type of the autofocus optical system. In this regard, HAMADA does not disclose that a combination of line sensors and monitor sensors are driven based on a type of autofocus optical system. The change in the monitor pixels is described at, e.g., column 10, lines 15-21 and column 11, lines 1-6.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that there is no disclosure in HAMADA that more than one type of autofocus photographing system is compatible with the focus detection device. In other words, providing compatibility with multiple

autofocus photographing systems is not in any way suggested by HAMADA, let alone the features recited in claim 1 that can be used to provide such compatibility. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation provided in HAMADA to modify the apparatus disclosed therein.

Accordingly, at least for the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claim 1. Applicants further submit that each of claims 2-9 is allowable at least for depending, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for additional reasons related to their own recitations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants have made a sincere effort to place the present application in condition for allowance and believe that they have now done so. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define the features of the claimed invention. Applicants have further explained features of the amended claims, and have set forth reasons why the combination of features recited in the claims are not taught, suggested or rendered obvious by the references applied in the outstanding Official Action. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejection of claims 1-9.

The amendments which have been presented by this Amendment, have not been specifically noted to overcome a rejection based upon the prior art, should be considered to have been made for a purpose unrelated to patentability, and no estoppel should be deemed to attach thereto.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully Submitted,
Masuhiro NAKATA et al.



William Pieprz
Reg. No. 33,630

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

January 25, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191